

REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

Allowable subject matter

Claims 2-17, 24 - 28 appear to be allowable over the prior art of record in light of Applicant's amendments and supporting arguments of record, subject to the results of a final search.

The applicant acknowledges the examiner's statements.

Claims 18 & 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Antes, Gary M., Let your 'knowbots' do the walking," Computerworld, May 13, 1991, pp(2), in view of Steinberg, Don, "Demon knowbots (intelligent software robots)," PC-Computing, v3, nl, pp(4), Jan, 1990, and further in view of Markoff, John, "The staggering scope of the Internet: a thicket of networks wound 'round the globe", Digital Media, vi, nil, p19(5) April 20, 1992.

As per independent claim 18:

Antes, as modified by Steinberg, teaches the invention substantially as claimed.

Antes, as modified by Steinberg, teaches a method for aiding communication with a mobile program executing in operating environments provided at nodes of a distributed system (as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1 as set forth in the last office action (paper #38, mailed July 11, 2003).

Antes & Steinberg do not explicitly disclose the following additional limitations:

Markoff teaches maintaining a name space [e.g., 'a variety of Internet "phonebooks"] that uniquely identifies [i.e., using an address and inherent associated name] types of information to be interchanged as part of the communication; and using a name [i.e., an address which can be construed as a unique identifying address or "name" in its own right, or an address that is inherently associated with a name, such as a name found within a phonebook that is comprised of types or categories of listings] within the name space to identify a type of information to be interchanged [p. 4]. See Markoff page 4, lines 26-34:

"Agents for browsing and retrieval. In the future, some computer scientists believe that it will be possible to devise software programs called "agents "that will automatically roam the Internet, browsing for information and retrieving it when it matches an owner's needs. One such agent - "knowledge robot" Knowbot already exists. Vincent Cerf, now a researcher at the Corporation for National Research Initiatives, has designed a program that systematically searches a variety of Internet "phonebooks" for an address and then mails back the information when it finds a match."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve upon the combined system taught by Antes & Steinberg by implementing the improvements detailed above because it would provide their system with the enhanced capability of using address listings (i.e., internet phonebooks) to browse the internet and find matching information the user is searching for [Markoff p. 4].

Response to arguments (independent claim 18)

Applicant argues that the Markoff reference "makes no reference, either direct or implied, to types of information let alone to the use of a name to refer to a type" [paper #40, page 7, 1st paragraph].

Examiner's response:

The Examiner submits that the phonebook addresses disclosed by Markoff do constitute the use of a name (i.e., address) within the name space (i.e., the phonebook address list) that uniquely identifies types of information (i.e., inherently associated information, such as user names, e-mail addresses and the like, as would necessarily be listed in a phonebook) to be interchanged as part of the communication.

Applicant's arguments, filed Jan. 15, 2004 (paper #40), have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive with respect to claims 18 & 19. The rejections set forth in the last office action are maintained for claims 18 and 19.

The applicant respectfully disagrees. Markoff, to be fair, says almost nothing that is relevant to the features recited in claim 18.

Amended claim 18 makes clear that the identifiers are used to identify one or more types of information that may be communicated with the mobile program that is executing in the distributed system. The identifiers of the types referred to in the claim thus are not the types themselves, but rather are identifiers that uniquely identify the types. The types being identified are not the information itself that is being communicated but rather the types of the information.

The substance of the cited passage of Markoff recites only "a program [designed by Vincent Cerf] that systematically searches a variety of Internet "phonebooks" for an address and then mails back the information when it finds a match." This clause makes no explicit reference to types of information, let alone to unique identifiers of those types. The address found by the Cerf program might be construed as a type of information being sought but Markoff neither discloses nor suggests the existence of any identifier of such a type, let alone that the identifier be unique. Although one could infer from Markoff that there is some name of a person that is to be sought in the phonebooks, that name, of course, would not be a unique identifier of a type.

For example, suppose the specific name "John Smith" is associated with a specific value of an email address (say "smith@dotnet.net"). In this context, the words "name" or "email address" refer to types of information. Many such types exist. In claim 18, each of those types could have a unique identifier. The type "name", for example, could have, as its unique identifier, a string of characters (say "412337ds"). Thus, even if different computer databases

used the same type "name" to refer to types having different data structures, the two types could be distinguished by the unique names of those types.

Markoff simply gives no hint of (as recited in claim 18) maintaining a name space that uniquely identifies one or more types of information that may be communicated, or, in connection with a communication, using the identifiers to uniquely indicate the one or more types of information being communicated.

As per claim 19 ...

Claim 19 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 18 on which it depends.

All dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

Cancelled claims, if any, have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance that the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Enclosed is a 475.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing 16054-008001.

Applicant : Robert E. Kahn et al.
Serial No. : 08/720,092
Filed : September 27, 1996
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 06154-008001

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/30/A



David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906